REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-6, 11, 16, 18, 21, 24, 29, 35, 41, 54-56, and 58-59 have been amended. Claims 19-20, 32 and 46-53 have been cancelled. Claim 61 is newly added. No new matter has been added.

Objections to Drawings

The drawings stand objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because the reference character "1104" shown in Figure 11 is not mentioned in the specification. In response to the objections, paragraph [0087] is amended such that the reference character "1104" is included in the specification. Applicant respectfully submits that since the substance to which reference character "1104" is referring has already been mentioned in the specification, the amendment does not add any new matter to the specification. Thus, objections to the drawings have been overcome.

Specification Objections

The specification stands objected to because of informalities. In response to the objections, the specification has been amended. No new matter, however, has been added. Further, the amendments are <u>not</u> made in response to the rejections or to comply with any statutory requirement of patentability, since no such amendments are believed to be necessary.

The Examiner also objects to the specification, alleging that the specification contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code (specifically in paragraph [0079]). Applicant respectfully submits that no such hyperlink or browser-executable code is

embedded in the specification. Thus, no correction is necessary in response to this objection.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw such objection.

Claim Objections

Claims 2, 16, 21, 24, 29, 35, 41, 48, 52, 55, 59, 18-22, and 56 are objected to because of

informalities. In response to the objections, claims 2, 16, 21, 24, 29, 35, 41, 55, 59, 18, and 56

are amended to overcome the objections.

Claim 32 is objected to as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit

the subject matter of a previous claim. Claim 32 has been cancelled.

Thus, all claim objections have been overcome.

Claim Rejections

§102 Rejections

Independent claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Thakker (U.S.

Patent no. 6,487,602). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites:

1. A method comprising:
   receiving a message sent over a network by a first user from a mobile device, the message conforming to an asynchronous messaging protocol for sending person-to-person messages between mobile devices;
   identifying a specified destination telephone number of the message;
   determining whether the specified destination telephone number corresponds to a predetermined telephone number;
   if the specified destination telephone number corresponds to the predetermined telephone number, then
      using an indicator in the message to identify network-based content that has been published by a second user, and
      sending the network-based content to the first user in response to the message, **without sending the message to an entity associated with the specified destination telephone number.**

14

(Emphasis added)

By contrast, Thakker does not teach or suggest the above emphasized limitations, namely determining whether the <u>specified destination telephone number of a message</u> corresponds to a <u>predetermined telephone number</u>, and if the specified destination telephone number corresponds to the predetermined telephone number, identifying a network-based content and sending the content in response to the message <u>without sending the message to an entity associated with the specified destination telephone number</u>.

Thakker discloses an E.164 number as the destination telephone number of a message sent from a mobile device. Thakker also discloses that the E.164 number is mapped with an IP-address and port number pair which uniquely identifies an application. The IP-address and port number pair, however, is <u>not a telephone number</u>, much less a predetermined telephone number. Thus, Thakker does not teach or suggest <u>determining whether the specified destination telephone number of a message corresponds to a predetermined telephone number</u>.

In addition, Thakker does not teach or suggest identifying network-based content and sending the content in response to the message, <u>without sending the message to an entity associated with the specified destination telephone number,</u> if the specified destination telephone number corresponds to the predetermined telephone number. In fact, Thakker discloses the opposite of the emphasized limitations recited in claim 1. Thakker's method sends a message, received from a mobile device, to an application <u>associated with the E.164 number of the message</u>, and uses the application to access network-based content. The application is associated with the E.164 number by mapping the E.164 number to the IP-address and port number pair which uniquely identifies the application.

15

Thus, Thakker does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1. At least

for the foregoing reasons, claim 1 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over Thakker.

Independent claims 33 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on

Nemirofsky (Pub. no. 2004/0117255). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 33 recites:

> 33. A method of accessing published content from a mobile device on a wireless
> network, the method comprising:
> outputting a user interface on the mobile device; and
> responding to **a single-action user input** directed to the user interface by
> requesting content from a remote processing system using a first message which
> conforms to an asynchronous messaging protocol for sending person-to-person messages
> between mobile devices.
> (Emphasis added)

By contrast, Nemirofsky does not teach or suggest <u>responding to a single-action user</u>

<u>input directed to the user interface by requesting content from a remote processing system using</u>

<u>a first message which conforms to an asynchronous messaging protocol for sending person-to-</u>

<u>person messages between mobile devices</u>, such as recited in claim 33. The Examiner, however,

alleges that Nemirofsky's paragraphs [0034], [0045], and [0055] teach the limitation. Applicant

respectfully disagrees. Paragraph [0034] discusses a method allowing a user to input a message

code manually by using a user interface provided by a universal digital assistant (UDA).

Paragraph [0045] discusses several other methods allowing a user to capture a message code by a

UDA, including, for example, capturing an image having the message code from TV video

signal. Paragraph [0055] discusses sending a captured message code to a UDA application site

which resolves the message code and returns an advertising message tailored to a particular user.

None of the above paragraphs discusses <u>a single-action user input</u> directed to a user interface and

responding the single-action user input by sending a message requesting content from a remote

processing system, such as recited in claim 33. Neither does the rest of Nemirofsky contain any suggestion or indication regarding <u>responding to a single-action user input directed to the user interface by requesting content from a remote processing system using a first message which conforms to an asynchronous messaging protocol for sending person-to-person messages between mobile devices</u>, such as recited in claim 33.

Thus, at least for the foregoing reasons, claim 33 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over Nemirofsky.

Similarly, claim 40 includes similar limitations as discussed above for claim 33. Thus, claim 40 and all claims which depend on it are also patentable over Nemirofsky.

§103 Rejections

Independent claim 12 stands rejected under §103(a) based on Thakker in view of Ohmae (Pub. no. US 2003/0053608). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 12 recites:

12. A method of providing access to network-based content, the method being performed in a processing system coupled to a wireless network and to a wireline computer network, the method comprising:

receiving a message sent over the wireless network by a first end user from a mobile device, the message conforming to an asynchronous messaging protocol for sending person-to-person messages between mobile devices, **the message including a telephone number of a second end user;**

identifying a destination telephone number to which the message is directed, wherein the destination telephone number is a telephone number of a network entity other than an end user;

determining whether the destination telephone number corresponds to a predetermined number;

if the destination telephone number corresponds to the predetermined number, then

identifying a predetermined indicator in the message,

using the telephone number of the second end user and the predetermined indicator in the message to identify network-based content that has been published by the second end user, and

sending the network-based content to the first end user.
(Emphasis added)

Thus, claim 12 essentially recites a message sent by a first end user from a mobile device, the message having <u>a telephone number of a second end user</u>. Because claim 12 also recites that the destination telephone number of the message is a telephone number of a network entity other than an end user, the telephone number of the second end user is different from the message's destination telephone number. The Examiner admits that Thakker fails to disclose the message including a telephone number of a second end user and using the telephone number of the second end user in the message to identify network-based content (*see* Office Action mailed on 1/27/2006, page 13).

Neither does Ohmae teach or suggest that a message sent by a first end user includes a telephone number of a <u>second</u> end user, different from the message's destination telephone number. The Examiner cites Ohmae's paragraphs [0081] and [0097]-[0098], but these cited sections only disclose that a user first connects the photographing terminal device to an image processing server through a network, and then enters the user's own information, such as telephone number, and sends the information to the image processing server for registration or authentication purposes. These cited sections have no discussion regarding a telephone number of a second end user; nor does the rest of Ohmae has discussion or even an indication regarding a message sent by a first end user includes a telephone number of a second end user, which is different from the message's destination telephone number, such as recited in claim 12.

Therefore, Thakker and Ohmae do not teach or suggest <u>all</u> of the limitations of claim 12, either individually or in combination.

Thus, at least for the foregoing reasons, the Examiner fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness under §103(a) regarding claim 12. Therefore, claim 12 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over the cited art.

Independent claim 18 stands rejected under §103(a) based on Thakker in view of Vatanen (Pub. no. US 2003/0078058). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 18 recites:

18. A method of providing access to network-based content, the method being performed in a processing system coupled to a wireless network and to a wireline computer network, the method comprising:
      receiving a message sent over the wireless network by a first end user from a mobile device, the message conforming to an asynchronous messaging protocol for sending person-to-person messages between mobile devices;
      identifying a destination telephone number to which the message is directed;
      determining whether the destination telephone number corresponds to a telephone number of a wireless carrier;
      if the destination telephone number corresponds to the telephone number of the wireless carrier, then
            identifying a predetermined indicator in the message,
            using the predetermined indicator to identify network-based content previously published by a second end user, and
            sending the network-based content to the first end user.
(Emphasis added)

Thakker and Vatanen, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above emphasized limitation in claim 18, namely determining whether the destination telephone number of a message corresponds to a <u>telephone number of a wireless carrier</u>, and identifying and sending network-based content to the user initiating the message, if there is a correspondence.

For the same reasons discussed above for claim 1, Thakker does not teach or suggest the above emphasized limitations in claim 18. Vatanen does not teach or suggest the above emphasized limitations in claim 18, either. Neither does the Examiner contend so.

Because Thakker and Vatanen, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest all

limitations of claim 18, claim 18 is not rendered obvious by Thakker and Vatanen. Therefore,

claim 18 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over Thakker and Vatanen.

Independent claims 23 and 28 stand rejected under §103(a) based on Ohmae in view of

Thakker. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 23 recites:

23. A method of publishing content from a mobile device on a wireless network, the method comprising:
        outputting a user interface on the mobile device; and
        responding to **a single-action user input directed to the user interface** by causing content to be transmitted from the mobile device to a remote processing system and stored in the remote processing system, such that the content, when stored in the remote processing system, is available for transmission to a second device in response to a message from the second device, the message conforming to an asynchronous messaging protocol for sending person-to-person messages between mobile devices. (Emphasis added)

Claim 23 essentially recites a <u>single-action</u> publishing mechanism. By contrast, Ohmae

and Trakker, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above claimed

invention, particularly <u>responding to a single-action user input directed to the user interface by</u>

<u>causing content to be transmitted from the mobile device to a remote processing system and</u>

<u>stored in the remote processing system</u>.

Ohmae discloses a method of uploading a photo to an image processing server.

However, Ohmae's method of uploading a photo involves multiple-action user input(s), not

<u>single-action user input</u>. For example, as shown in Ohmae's figure 7 and discussed in Ohmae's

paragraphs [0087] – [0095], a user needs to send out user authentication information to the image

processing server first, and then the image later. Even entering the user authentication

<div align="center">20</div>

information in Ohmae involves multiple actions, because the user needs to press the keypad of

the mobile device more than once to enter his/her user ID and password.

Neither does Thakker teach or suggest <u>responding to a single-action user input directed to</u>

<u>the user interface by causing content to be transmitted from the mobile device to a remote</u>

<u>processing system and stored in the remote processing system</u>. Thakker discloses a method of

sending a short message from a mobile device to a remote application for information, such as

stock quotes, sports scores, etc. Thakker, however, does not teach or suggest sending content to

a remote processing system and storing the content in the processing system in response to <u>a</u>

<u>single-action user input</u> directed to a user interface on a mobile device.

Therefore, at least for the foregoing reasons, the Examiner fails to make a *prima facie*

case of obviousness under §103(a). Claim 23 and all claims which depend on it are patentable

over Ohmae and Thakker.

Similarly, claim 28 recites essentially similar limitations discussed above for claim 23.

Thus, for similar reasons, claim 28 and all claims which depend on it are also patentable over

Ohmae and Thakker.

Independent claims 54 and 58 stands rejected under §103(a) based on Ohmae in view of

Thakker. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 54 recites:

54. A method of providing a directory of published content to a user of a mobile device
operating on a wireless network, the method comprising:
        receiving a first message from the mobile device via the wireless network, the
first message initiated by a first user using the mobile device, the first message
conforming to an asynchronous messaging protocol for sending person-to-person
messages between mobile devices;
        detecting a predetermined indicator in the first message, wherein **the
predetermined indicator indicates that the first message is not to be sent to a**

destination of the first message but to request content associated with the destination; and

in response to detecting the predetermined indicator in the first message,

identifying a set of published network-based content associated with the destination and accessible to the first user, and

sending to the mobile device a second message identifying the set of network-based content, as a response to the first message, the second message conforming to said protocol.

(emphasis added)

By contrast, Ohmae and Thakker, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a predetermined indicator which indicates that a message is not to be sent to the destination of the message, but to request content associated with the destination, such as recited in claim 54.

Ohmae discloses a method to view an image uploaded onto an image processing server. Ohmae's method involves sending authentication information first by the viewing user and then sending information to identify image to be viewed. Ohmae does not teach or suggest that a message sent to the image processing server includes a predetermined indicator indicating that the message is not to be sent to the destination of the message, but to request content associated with the destination.

Neither does Thakker teach or suggest such a predetermined indicator indicating that the message is not to be sent to the destination of the message, but to request content associated with the destination. As discussed above, Thakker discloses a method for sending a short message from a mobile device to a remote application. Although the message is to access the remote application for information, the message does not include any predetermined indicator indicating that the message is not to be sent to the remote application. Moreover, the message in Thakker is always sent to the remote application.

Thus, at least for the foregoing reasons, Ohmae and Thakker do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 54. Therefore, the Examiner fails to make a *prima facie* case of

obviousness under §103(a). Claim 54 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over Ohmae and Thakker.

Similarly, claim 58 recites essentially similar limitations discussed above for claim 54. Thus, for similarly reasons, claim 58 and all claims which depend on it are also patentable over Ohmae and Thakker.

Dependent Claims

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 4/27/06

Jordan M. Becker
Reg. No. 39,602

Customer No. 26529
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300